

The Relationship Between Logic and Archetypes

A philosopher is not a wolf or a sheep.

Particularly a logical philosopher is not a goat or a seagull.

We might consider evolution as the development of brains. For the moment we could choose to set aside and temporarily forget all the physical bodies and the species and the taxonomies of life forms. We'll get back to them almost immediately. But, just for a moment, let's think of brains by themselves.

So the simple life form comes into existence as a result of a replicating quality of protein chemistry. It doesn't have something we would call a brain yet but it has the first building block of a brain, the ability to add to its own physical structure and to discard the unwanted bits of its chemistry. In other words it can, sort of, eat and excrete. It develops irritability which is the beginning of something which become a mind. Irritability means it can react to "food" and by this word "food" I mean chemicals which it can use to rebuild itself in an ongoing way.

As the life form becomes more complex, building onto its structure, it reaches the stage of cannibalism. Micro-organisms consuming other micro-organisms. At that stage the tiny thing might want to go where it can eat and go where it can avoid being eaten. To do this it needs to have some way of remembering which directions and places are "good" for it or "bad" for it.

Memory and archetypes begin at the same time as each other.
Memory and archetypes are part and parcel of the same thing.

In its simplest form the archetype says "Go to the remembered good place or thing" and "get away from the remembered bad place or thing".

From then onwards, over millions of years of evolution, the archetypes need to develop complexity to match the complexity of the living creature's environment. So when a creature has developed mothers, fathers and extended family structures it needs to also have archetypes for that.

When evolution has made the journey all the way from being a unicellular organism to being a philosopher in Ancient Greece it has developed a whole range of archetypes such as mother, father, sister, brother, wise man, fool, god, goddess, messenger, cook, worker in stone and metal and wood, gardener, hunter, fighter, peacemaker, king, queen, prince, princess, slave, official, guardian, entertainer, musician, singer, clown, prostitute, monk, nun, virgin, priest, priestess, attacker, defender, rescuer, searcher, monster, predator, storm, sun, moon, stars, tree, forest, fruit, cave, underground cavern, mountain, hill, valley, ocean, river, house, garden, and so on.

So the instinct in the Ancient Greek philosopher is essentially the same as the first ever instinct in the primitive organism: "Go towards good" and "Go away from bad".

The philosopher, however, has a developed brain and this gives them the ability to question their instincts. Questions then become a new kind of archetype.

So the philosopher can ask questions like "Is the good thing really bad?" or "Is the bad thing really good?" and "How do we know? Is there proof?"

The early philosopher is part of the same archetype as judge, lawmaker, law enforcer and investigator.

The philosopher and the police officer perform the functions of the archetype which asks "What do we know? What do we not know? What is really the case?"

So Carl Jung's four personality types are tools which we can use to figure out how this relationship works between logic and archetypes.

There is the thinking type and the intuitive type. The intuitive type is able to jump to conclusions and can often be right and make right decisions because intuition is responding to the inherited instincts or archetypes of situations. Inner images and stories which warn us subconsciously of the way things are likely to go. The thinking type prefers to question the archetypal instinctive forms and, consequently, is slower than the intuitive type. However, questioning the instincts and archetypes allows the thinking type to discover new knowledge and so to make progress where the intuitive type might have faltered.

The other two types are called by Jung the Feeling Type and the Sensation Type. The Feeling Type is motivated primarily by emotions and emotional attachments. The Sensation Type is motivated primarily by physical sensations of pain and pleasure, hunger, thirst, sex and all the physical needs. The word "feeling" can sometimes be misleading in this context because we use that word sometimes when talking about emotional feelings and sometimes when talking about physical sensations. Nevertheless it is not difficult to map out the logic of the physical three centres of Freud's Reality Principle and Pleasure Principle and their connection to the intuitive archetypal pattern recognition of situations and characters.

The philosopher's logic cuts into this playing out of archetypal theatre roles and asks the question "Is there another way of looking at all of this? Are we missing something?"

So the relationship between logic and archetypes is one of procedural analysis compared with a stack of ready made perceptions.